

REMARKS

The Examiner has rejected claims 1-36 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being unpatentable over Himmel et al (US 6,742,052). This ground of rejection is respectfully traversed.

The present invention relates to accessing network-accessible devices (such as but not limited to Internet-connected printers) with client computers via a network. The present application includes:

- independent claims 1 and 6, which recite a system for accessing network-accessible devices and a system for accessing Internet-connected printers, respectively,
- independent claims 8 and 13, which recite a network-accessible device and an Internet-connected printer, respectively,
- independent claim 14, which recites a client device,
- independent claims 21, 29 and 32, which recite a method for accessing network-accessible devices, a method for accessing Internet-accessible devices, and a method of accessing an Internet-connected printer, respectively, and
- independent claims 28 and 36, which both recite one or more computer-readable media.

All of these independent claims include two common features: 1) wirelessly transmitting address data associated with a network-accessible device from the network-accessible device to one or more client computers, and 2) using the wirelessly transmitted address data to establish a network link with the one or more client computers and the network-accessible device to permit the client devices to access and interact with the network-accessible device.

Himmel et al does not anticipate both of these two features. Instead, Himmel et al discloses a wireless system bus for establishing a direct wireless communication link between a computer and a peripheral device within proximity of the computer. Figure 5 of Himmel et al shows a computer 120 having a wireless internal system bus for communicating with a wireless peripheral device 122. The computer 120 includes a digital transceiver 128 coupled to the internal bus 25, and the peripheral device 122 includes a digital

transceiver 130. Thus, direct wireless communication is possible between the computer 120 and the peripheral device 122 via the two digital transceivers 128 and 130.

In rejecting the claims, the Examiner contends that the computer 120 of Himmel et al corresponds to the claimed client computer device and the peripheral device 122 corresponds to the claimed network-accessible device. However, applicant respectfully submits that Himmel et al fails to anticipate independent claims 1, 6, 8, 13, 14, 21, 28, 29, 32 and 36 for the following reasons.

First, Himmel et al does not disclose wirelessly transmitting address data associated with the peripheral device 122 from the peripheral device 122 to the computer 120. This is in contrast to the present application, which as stated above, claims wirelessly transmitting address data associated with a network-accessible device from the network-accessible device to one or more client computers. While Himmel et al does describe wireless communication between the computer 120 and the peripheral device 122, there is no indication in Himmel et al that peripheral device address data is sent from the peripheral device 122 to the computer. As described in column 9, lines 25-30 of Himmel et al, the bus driver of the computer 120 assigns an address to the peripheral device 122, and this address is transmitted from the computer to the peripheral device. Thus, the address is transmitted from the computer to the peripheral device, not from the peripheral device to the computer, as required by the present claims. Lines 21-24 in column 9 state that the "identification" of the peripheral device 122 is transmitted to the computer 120, but this identification pertains to what type of device the peripheral device 122 is and not a network address (see column 8, line 65 through column 9, line 2 and the third step in claim 1 of Himmel et al, which recites "identifying the particular frequency, wherein the particular frequency identifies the peripheral device by type and is not a network frequency" (emphasis added)).

Second, Himmel et al does not disclose the claimed feature of using wirelessly transmitted address data to establish a network link between one or more client computers and the network-accessible device to permit the client devices to access and interact with the network-accessible device. On the contrary, Himmel et al establishes a direct wireless communication link (either serial or parallel) directly between the computer 120 and the peripheral device 122. The primary embodiments of Himmel et al simply do not contemplate a network connection.

Figure 11 of Himmel et al does show an alternative embodiment that provides an indirect means for connecting with a peripheral device. Specifically, the computer 120 establishes wireless communication with a transformer 290 that is maintained in the proximity of the computer 120. The transformer 290, which is connected to a network 292, directs communications over the network 292 to a controller 294. The controller 294 in turn communicates with a wireless peripheral device 122. Accordingly, the computer 120 can be connected with the peripheral device 122 via the network 292.

However, unlike the claimed invention, the peripheral device 122 of the Figure 11 embodiment still does not wirelessly transmit its address data to the computer 120. Instead, Himmel et al states that "the network IP address of the peripheral 122 must be provided to the transformer 290 and the network IP address of the transformer 290 must be provided to the peripheral device 122 so that communications can be directed between the two devices" (column 11, lines 57-61). There is no indication of wirelessly transmitting peripheral device address data from the peripheral device 122 to the computer 120. Accordingly, Figure 11 of Himmel et al does not anticipate the independent claims.

For the above reasons, it is respectfully submitted that independent claims 1, 6, 8, 13, 14, 21, 28, 29, 32 and 36 are allowable over Himmel et al. Claims 2-5, 7, 9-12, 15-20, 22-27, 30-31, and 33-35 depend from claim 1, 6, 8, 14, 21, 29 or 32 and are thus also believed to be allowable.

Appl. No. 09/929,424

Atty. Docket No. 10011005-1

In view of the above, it is submitted that the claims are in condition for allowance. Reconsideration of the objections and rejections is requested. Allowance of claims 1-36 at an early date is solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

2/4/05

Date

Patrick R. Scanlon

Patrick R. Scanlon

Reg. No. 34,500

207-791-3110